

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/805,224

Applicant(s)

YU ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan M. Nutter

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan M. Nutter.

(3) _____.

(2) James Balls.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11,12,14,15,20 and 22-24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Silbiger et al (US 6,248,838), Buehler et al (US 5,316,578) and Frische et al (US 5,374,304).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposes to remove the recitation "substantially soluble in water" to remove the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The instant claims recite "consisting essentially of" which limits the scope of a claim to the specified ingredients and those that do not materially affect the composition. The reference to Silbiger requires a maximum of 50% by weight starch. The inclusion of starch in claim 1 exceeds 65 % by weight. The reference fails to teach or suggest reasoning to employ more. The reference to Frische et al includes unacceptable levels of water and fails to teach the use of natural starch or hydroxyalkyl starch, as recited herein. The reference to Buehler et al cannot be seen to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference or the secondary reference. Buehler et al fails to specify any particular amount of starch and lacks natural starch as recited herein. The references are not deemed to be proper analogous art for use together in a rejection of the claims. Any and all responses will be given full consideration .